2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

14 June 2005

Original: English

Summary record of the 22nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 27 May 2005, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. de Queiroz Duarte ..... (Brazil)

Contents

Credentials of representatives of the Conference

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee

Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference

Consideration and adoption of Final Document(s)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

05-36249 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Credentials of representatives to the Conference

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee

1. **The President** said that the delegations of Angola, Uruguay and Zambia, having submitted their respective notifications of participation, had requested to be included in the list of States parties participating in the Conference. The requests had been brought to the attention of the Acting Chairman of the Credentials Committee.

2. He took it that the Conference wished Angola, Uruguay and Zambia to be added to the list of participating States parties.

3. *It was so decided.*

Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference (NPT/CONF.2005/51)

4. **The President** drew attention to document NPT/CONF.2005/51 containing the schedule of division of costs based on the actual participation of States parties in the Conference. The document should be seen in conjunction with rule 12 of, and the appendix to, the rules of procedure adopted by the Conference on 2 May 2005. The addition of Angola, Uruguay and Zambia to the States parties participating in the Conference would be factored into the estimated costs borne by participants.

5. He took it that the Conference wished to adopt the schedule of division of costs as contained in document NPT/CONF.2005/51.

6. *It was so decided.*

Consideration and adoption of Final Document(s)

7. **The President** drew attention to the draft Final Document of the Conference, contained in document NPT/CONF.2005/DC/1. The only outstanding section of the document, entitled "Financial arrangements", reflected the adoption by the Conference of the cost-sharing formula contained in document NPT/CONF.2005/51.

8. He took it that the Conference wished to adopt the section entitled "Financial arrangements".

9. *It was so decided.*

10. **The President** said that since all sections of the draft final document had been adopted, he took it that the Conference wished to adopt the draft Final Document as a whole, as contained in document NPT/CONF.2005/DC/1.

11. *It was so decided.*

12. **Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo** (Spain) said that his delegation fully endorsed the statement made by the representative of Luxembourg as President of the European Union.

13. **Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the statement made during the previous meeting of the Conference by the representative of Malaysia on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned States Parties to the Treaty. In the spirit of multilateralism, the Group had conceded far more than necessary in an effort to ensure that the Conference produced, not a perfect document, nor a series of repetitive statements, but rather a realistic, balanced and forward-looking strategy designed to improve the safety of all States parties.

14. In view of the grave threat posed by nuclear weapons, it was essential that States parties should evaluate the work of the Conference from the global perspective. The Conference had emphasized that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was a multilateral instrument which concerned not only the proliferation of nuclear weapons but also disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Unless all States, particularly nuclear-weapon States, worked assiduously to achieve complete disarmament and non-proliferation, it would not be surprising if future Review Conferences concluded in the same manner as the 2005 Review Conference.

15. Sierra Leone wished to pay tribute to the representatives of civil society and the individuals who had made an important contribution to the work of the Conference by reminding States parties of their moral obligation to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear weapons. It was to be hoped that the outcome of the Conference would be duly taken into account at the forthcoming sessions of the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

16. **Mr. Hu** Xiaodi (China) said that the 2005 Review Conference had taken place against the backdrop of a complex international security situation. The

non-proliferation regime faced new challenges as the result of the current difficulties of the multilateral arms control and disarmament processes. The issue of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy also faced new challenges.

17. Although it was regrettable that the 2005 Review Conference had failed to produce a substantive final document, the exchanges between States parties had reflected the importance that they attached to the Treaty, as well as their political determination to maintain and strengthen the non-proliferation regime. The Treaty continued to play a crucial role in maintaining the regime and reducing the nuclear threat to world peace and security, and it also provided a model for the international community in its efforts to solve security concerns through multilateralism. China firmly believed in the Treaty's universality, effectiveness and authority and remained committed to its three major goals of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

18. **Mr. Parnohadiningrat** (Indonesia) said that his delegation fully endorsed the statement made by the representative of Malaysia on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned States Parties to the Treaty. The review process would hopefully strengthen and deepen the existing consensus on non-proliferation, disarmament and the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and return to the central themes of the consensus documents adopted in 1995 and 2000.

19. It was regrettable, however, that the Conference had spent too much time on procedural matters while relegating substantial issues to the margins. Participants had not adopted a results-based process, and had evaded their responsibilities and commitments. As a result, it had not proved possible to adopt a consensus-based substantive document. Much, therefore, remained to be done. In the meantime, however, States parties must send a clear and unequivocal statement of their continued commitment to the Treaty in all its aspects.

20. The threat to security posed by nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction had also become a matter of concern in the context of regional cooperation. In that regard, he would draw the attention of participants to the Declaration on the New Asian-African Strategic Partnership, adopted at the Summit Meeting of the Leaders of Asian and African Countries, held in Jakarta in April 2005, in which the signatories recognized that issues of common concern, such as weapons of mass destruction, were fundamental to ensuring peace, stability and security. Indonesia remained convinced that, in view of the continued threat posed by weapons of mass destruction, preserving and strengthening the Treaty was vital to international peace and security.

21. **Mr. Minty** (South Africa) said that his delegation fully endorsed the statement made by the representative of Malaysia on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned States Parties to the Treaty, as well as the remarks made by the representative of Indonesia concerning the Summit Meeting held in Jakarta. South Africa also welcomed the outcome of the talks held in Geneva between Iran and the three European Union countries, France, Germany and the United Kingdom, and hoped that they would continue their discussions in the context of the Paris Agreement of 15 November 2004.

22. South Africa urged States parties to guard against continually reopening the debate on obligations, commitments and undertakings, because, in doing so, they provided others with the grounds for reinterpreting, negating or withdrawing from other parts of agreements reached. Nuclear-weapon States should therefore reaffirm the commitments and unequivocal undertakings they had made at the previous Review Conferences to eliminate their nuclear arsenals systematically and progressively.

23. The primary objective of non-proliferation was the elimination of all nuclear weapons. Article VI of the Treaty required that non-nuclear-weapon States should not acquire such weapons and that nuclear-weapons States should eliminate them. It was regrettable that the Conference had missed the opportunity to make progress on the most pertinent challenges facing the Treaty. Such progress would be made, not by tinkering with procedures, but by mobilizing the necessary political will to build on previous undertakings and commitments.

24. **Mr. Scherba** (Ukraine) said it was unfortunate that the Conference had concluded with modest results, and without having achieved a breakthrough. States parties were far from having achieved a common understanding regarding the threats and challenges to the non-proliferation-treaty regime and the decisions that must be taken to close the loopholes in the Treaty

and strengthen its credibility. It was more urgent than ever that substantive measures should be taken to reconcile States parties' divergent interests, with a view to preserving the integrity of the Treaty and honouring the commitments made at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences. Erosion of the Treaty's credibility would have serious repercussions for world security and stability.

25. **Mr. Labbe** (Chile) said that his delegation felt both frustration and regret at the failure of the Conference. Its frustration stemmed from the fact that, as the result of procedural manoeuvres, the Conference had failed to agree on a final document reflecting the majority view. Its sense of regret derived from the fact that the political will of an overwhelming majority of States parties had been frustrated by the deadening effect of the use of the consensus principle.

26. The outcome of the Conference demonstrated that all States parties enjoyed a de facto right of veto and that certain delegations were ready to use that right. It might be wondered whether multilateralism could ever succeed if the overwhelming majority of participants could ultimately be rendered impotent and if democracy was not practised within multilateral institutions and forums. Multilateralism should ultimately be reflected, not in words, but in deeds, in the capacity for leadership, and in the willingness to share in the desires and needs of other States. Chile was ready to join with other, like-minded States in exploring ways to give voice to the frustrated majority.

27. **Mr. Zarif** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the consensus achieved at the 2000 Review Conference had been based partly on a solemn undertaking by nuclear-weapon States to pursue systematic efforts to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons. The 2005 Review Conference could, and should, have represented a turning point on the road towards a nuclear-free world.

28. The fact that the 2005 Conference had failed to achieve a positive outcome, despite the good intentions of many States around the globe, was no reflection on those States. Far more serious was the fact that the world's only remaining super-Power, the United States of America, had relentlessly pursued certain goals and actions without the slightest regard for the rest of the international community.

29. By adopting its Nuclear Posture Review the United States had broken its commitment to irreversibility, to a diminished role for nuclear weapons, and to the lowering of their operational status. It had also replaced the principle of destruction with that of decommissioning, and had abrogated the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which was recognized as the cornerstone of global strategic stability. It continued to deploy nuclear forces in other territories and to provide a nuclear umbrella for non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty, and had signed a nuclear cooperation agreement with Israel, whose nuclear arsenal represented the gravest danger to peace and stability in the Middle East. It had also rejected the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, as well as the inclusion of the element of "verifiability" in a future fissile material cut-off treaty. It therefore appeared that nuclear weapons were in the most dangerous hands.

30. The Treaty remained the cornerstone of nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the ability to develop and pursue nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The United States had wanted the Review Conference to fail so that it could pursue its own unilateral initiatives and priorities. That must not be allowed. States parties to the Treaty should join non-governmental organizations in strengthening ways to achieve the objectives of the Treaty by vigorously pursuing the decisions and resolutions of the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences.

31. The main concerns of States parties were to ensure full universality of the Treaty, to strengthen the collective efforts of States parties to check proliferation, to help the International Atomic Energy Agency improve the supervision of nuclear activities and its guarantees against proliferation, to emphasize security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, and to enable States parties to exercise their full rights to develop and produce nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The Islamic Republic of Iran was committed to the Treaty and to the non-proliferation regime, and would spare no efforts in that regard.

32. **The President** said that the proceedings of the Conference had strengthened his conviction that the Treaty enjoyed the full support of all States parties.

33. He declared the Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 4.05 p.m.